

and done it on gigantic scale. This is the right to life and property.

A short but interesting treatment of the subject of "Barbarians Within the City Gates," was recently contained in the selection bulletin of the Conservative Book Club. There are alternatives to the present approaches which obviously have not worked. I submit this statement to show firm alternatives which could defend civilization.

The statement follows:

Speaking of civil rights, it has always been our oldfashioned notion that the basic one is the right to the protection of life and property. This has historically been the position of Anglo-Saxon justice, which used to provide the ultimate penalty for any number of crimes against person or property, whether committed on the sands of Arizona or the streets of London. The reasoning was simple enough. The civilized—those who respect the rights of others—are always at a disadvantage against planned or random violence. So society tried to restore the balance. Society saw, moreover, that every crime unpunished was an attack on every innocent person, was an invitation for the jungle to come back and again smother the cleared land, was a sin that cried to heaven for vengeance. Today society faces a new menace, without precedent in the history of civilized man.

The barbarians are *within* the city gates—and the elders of the city speak out not for the victims (including the Negro victims), but for the barbarians. The city guardians, spewing an acid called Liberalism that eats away at every edifice in the city, watch their walls crumbling—and can only call for urban renewal. More ominous still, our traditional political give-and-take seems all but paralyzed. Has lawlessness gone so far we are now traumatized? We think not, though it could reach that point. But society's organs are enfeebled by the Liberal poison. Political and opinion leaders, even those in the conservative opposition, are slow to identify the gravest domestic crisis in our country's history. The Liberals still jabber away, like senile idiots, or carnival con men, about more federal money to cool our ever-longer, ever-hotter summers.

Meanwhile, in the Newark riot, a neatly dressed couple were seen busily loading boxes of shoes into their 1967 Cadillac. How long before conservative leaders dare to tell the emperor that he has no clothes on? For openers, we commend these measures to federal and state legislators: 1) For anyone guilty of riots or burning or looting, the death penalty. (If this seems harsh, blame the Liberals who let things go so far. You don't cure smallpox with aspirin.) 2) Riot victims to be compensated for personal injury and property damage by having first claim on all personal property of any rioter or looter. 3) If victims are still owed more after this, further compensation to come out of welfare and poverty funds allocated to the riot area. 4) State police, local police and national guard units to be bolstered everywhere, paid better (they deserve it, and it's cheaper than Watts and Detroit and Newark and, God forbid, maybe your own town), trained intensively in crime prevention and, especially, in anti-riot tactics.

Beyond the legislative area, we urge political and citizen groups to spend their efforts in research and publicity to let voters know which politicians and judges are the bleeding hearts, which the defenders of civilization. Finally, Gresham's Law works in sociology as in money. We hear so few responsible Negroes speak out not because they don't exist, but because whites have shrunk from defending orderly society. Decent Negroes, remember, are on the front lines, and they can hardly be blamed for wondering whether we'll defend them, when we don't even defend

ourselves. When we can give evidence that riots do not pay, a different kind of Negro leader is likely to emerge. The lesson of foreign affairs applies to our cities; be firm, and barbarians will retreat.

AM

THE MEGATONNAGE GAP

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. Gross) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have inserted in the RECORD material concerning this Nation's hesitancy to proceed with the construction of antiballistic missile systems here in the United States. As anyone knows who has been following this issue, the Soviet Union has deployed ABM systems in the Moscow and Leningrad areas.

In July of this year the House Armed Services Committee released a report compiled by the American Security Council, a highly respected research and educational organization in the area of national security, entitled "The Changing Strategic Military Balance—United States Versus U.S.S.R." This report has received wide coverage by newspapers here in the United States. For a small sampling of editorial comment on the report I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point editorials from the Evening Tribune of San Diego, Calif., dated July 21, 1967; the Elgin Courier News of Elgin, Ill., dated July 20, 1967; and the Youngstown, Ohio, Vindicator, of July 12, 1967.

The material referred to follows:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune, July 21, 1967]

UNITED STATES CANNOT AFFORD MEGATONNAGE GAP

There is great concern, and with good reason, that in the nuclear race with Russia, the Soviets are running and the United States is walking.

This means that despite the advantages of an early lead, the United States is being passed in the drive for strategic military superiority.

What the United States may be facing soon, if not already, is a serious megatonnage gap. Megatonnage is a summation of a nation's nuclear force, the total atomic power that can be delivered by strategic weapons.

When we are on the short side of a megatonnage gap, it means the Soviets can hit the United States with a larger nuclear destructive force than we can hit them.

At present there is a slight megatonnage gap. But not too long ago, we had the scales tilted heavily in our favor. It will not be long before the scales are weighted by some degree on the other side.

A group of 17 military experts, most of them retired high ranking officers of the armed forces, recently made a study of the changing strategic military balance between the United States and Russia.

The men compiling the report worked as a special subcommittee of the American Security Council, a non-profit association engaged in national security research and education. The report was made at the request of the House Armed Services Committee and was based on unclassified information.

The report warns that "the United States has exchanged its goal of a war-winning strategic superiority for a strategy of mutual deterrence," whereas Russia "is driving hard toward a goal of overwhelming superiority in the decisive field of nuclear weaponry."

A contributing factor to the present situation, the committee found, was an inclination of officials in this country to discount Russian advances. There was the same inclination in regard to Russian space achievements until the Russians proved time and time again their advanced technology in a space program.

The report said, "the available evidence indicates that the Soviet Union has a goal of strategic superiority designed to win a nuclear war rather than merely deter one."

The report says that in this year the United States does not appear to have a superior position in deliverable strategic weapons.

The present situation need not be permanent. "There is still time to regain superiority," the report says, "but time is on the side of the one which uses it."

While there is still time, the United States must be the one to make full use of it.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, July 12, 1967]

RUSSIA GAINS GROUND

The proponents of developing an antiballistic missile defense for this country will gain strong support from the study made public today by the American Security Council. The report was prepared for the House Armed Services Committee by a special subcommittee of the council. The committee is one to command respect, for it is headed by Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, and includes such men as Vice Admiral Elton W. Grenfell, Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Dr. Edward Teller, and Admiral Ben Moreell.

The study is entitled, "The Changing Strategic Balance U.S.A. vs. U.S.S.R." It emphasizes repeatedly that the Soviet Union is moving toward "overwhelming superiority in the decisive field of nuclear weaponry," while the American aim is for "a strategy of mutual deterrence."

The report estimates (all its information is from unclassified sources) that in 1962, the United States could have delivered between 25,000 and 50,000 megatons of nuclear destruction, while the Soviet Union's capability was between 6,000 and 12,000 megatons. By 1971, the experts believe, this country's capability will be between 6,000 and 15,000 megatons, while Russia will have between 30,000 and 50,000 megatons.

At several points, the study recalls that Russian leaders have said repeatedly that "Communism's ultimate goal is world domination." It indicates that American policymakers prefer not to listen, and it quotes Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara as saying "it will become increasingly probable that either side could destroy a sufficiently large portion of the other's strategic force . . . to preclude a devastating retaliatory load."

The committee shows concern over the growth of Soviet capacity which would warrant Moscow in trying for a "knockout nuclear first strike." Nuclear blackmail, with the threat of a rain of ICBMs or attack from orbiting space weapons (forbidden by treaty, of course) could leave the United States only the choice of firing its own nuclear weapons first, or of surrendering.

No one wants to add unnecessary expense to the heavy financial burden that war and defense already have laid on the country. On the other hand, a warning from a committee of this caliber must get careful consideration.

[From the Elgin (Ill.) Courier News, July 20, 1967]

WEAPONS RACE: A CAUSE FOR ALARM

The administration of Lyndon B. Johnson is frequently said to be politically astute because it keeps its "options" open.

It would be more astute if it followed the same policy in defense.

Comparing the strategic nuclear capability of the United States today with that of the Soviet Union, an expert panel of 18 defense specialists associated with the American Security Council reports:

"... Placing our sole reliance for deterrence on ... missiles and the remaining manned bomber force, the United States places itself in the dangerous position of having only one option left if it is faced with a Soviet ultimatum to surrender."

It would be encouraging if the option we have were of such superior power that the Soviet Union would not think of challenging it.

Unfortunately, the Security Council experts found the opposite to be true. "The United States," it reported, "has exchanged its goals of a war-winning strategic superiority for a strategy of mutual deterrence," whereas the Soviet Union "is driving hard toward a goal of overwhelming superiority in the decisive field of nuclear weaponry."

The council's contention that the Soviet Union will have an unquestioned superiority in the tons of destruction it can rain on us is a matter for national alarm. The fact that our equality of strategic response is under question even today is fearsome.

When the Administration embarks on a policy of so-called "mutual deterrence" it must remember that it is a principle that takes the participation of two. So far it has been practiced by only one—the United States of America. While the cult of cost computers has been theorizing and disarming the United States since 1962, the Russians have been building up their vast complex of offensive weapons, still making clear that intention of world domination.

Unfortunately, we cannot retrieve time. Equally, it is important that we do not lose any more. As the Security Council points out, there still is time for the United States to regain strategic superiority—"but time is on the side of the one which uses it."

This is the critical year. To regain superiority by 1971; the United States must begin construction and deployment of its strategic forces build-up today.

High on the list of these is the anti-ballistic missile system, which the Soviet Union already has deployed around key cities. As Security Council experts point out, this system at least in the final analysis could "strengthen the hand of the President if he is confronted (with a Soviet ultimatum to surrender) and it might stay the hand of an enemy at a critical moment in history."

That critical moment in history is not in the future when missiles begin raining, but today. If the United States makes the wrong decision again in defense, the whole world might face slavery.

PIRATES ON THE BARBARY COAST

(Mr. ASHBROOK (at the request of Mr. Gross) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the events surrounding the kidnaping of Moise Tshombe are still vague and it is doubtful that the \$200,000 documentary, "Tshombe in Algeria," offered for sale by the Algerian Government will provide much substantiation. But it does tend to indicate that Algeria had some prior notice of events which brought the former Congolese Premier to capture there.

An editorial in the August 22, edition of the Chicago Tribune details the base "diplomacy" which has surrounded the imprisonment of Tshombe from the start.

It would appear that Tshombe is still being held, Algeria and Mobutu are still bickering over his diplomatic worth and hopefully, the President of the United States and Department of State officials are attempting to have justice prevail from behind the scenes, as was announced. With such acts as are outlined in the editorial, possibly the cause of justice would be advanced if the actions of our Government were made public along with their successes and failures. Public opinion should have the chance to be heard in the case of this friend of the United States and of worldwide freedom.

The editorial follows:

PIRATES ON THE BARBARY COAST

In one of the most impudent acts of diplomatic history, the Algerian government offered to sell for \$200,000 a half-hour film entitled "Tshombe in Algeria"—a film which begins, astonishingly enough, with the moment Tshombe landed in Algeria with his kidnapers. The British plane which the former Congolese premier had chartered to fly between two Spanish islands in the Mediterranean was hijacked and flown to Algiers.

Algeria has denied being a party to the kidnaping, yet a film crew seems to have been on hand at the airport to record the arrival of the hijacked plane. Was there time to make these unusual preparations after the pilot had notified the Algiers control tower of his predicament and asked permission to land? (He was told to land instead at a military airport 25 miles out of the city.)

Or did Algerian officials know all along what was afoot? This possibility cannot be dismissed, because Algeria's bias against Tshombe has been conspicuous throughout the incident and its behavior has been disgraceful.

It refused a visa to Mrs. Tshombe, who wanted to be with her husband. It refused to allow representatives of the Belgian government to see the Belgian citizens who were aboard Tshombe's plane. It held secret hearings on the matter of Tshombe's extradition to the Congo, where he has been sentenced in absentia to death for treason. It has been accused of using Tshombe as bait to win the Congo's vote in favor of a pro-Arab resolution against Israel in the United Nations. The Congo lent credence to this charge by voting as Algeria wanted it to, even though its sympathies have normally been with Israel. The Congo's request for extradition was granted even though the two countries have no diplomatic relations and even though, under international usage, extradition is not applicable in political crimes.

Now comes the crowning insolence—Algeria's effort to pick up a few extra dollars on the side as a result of Tshombe's misfortune. This is reducing diplomacy to a mercenary level which makes the television quiz scandals look like Sunday school. It is a revival of the piracy which plagued American shipping on the Barbary coast more than a century ago. We trust that nobody in this country will show any interest in Algeria's offer unless Tshombe himself comes with the film—and even that would amount to ransom.

BILLS INTRODUCED TO ASSIST RAILROADS

(Mr. REID of New York (at the request of Mr. Gross) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today two bills to provide assistance to railroads, and specifically, to the New Haven Railroad.

The first bill would extend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to guarantee loans to certain rail carriers to finance or refinance additions and betterments or other capital expenditures made after January 1, 1957, or to finance or refinance expenditures made for maintenance of property. The ICC's authority to guarantee such loans under a previous program expired in 1963.

The second bill would give the Department of Transportation authority to provide financial assistance to passenger railroads to aid them in preserving and improving essential passenger services and facilities. Assistance would be based upon an application indicating that a plan of action had been formulated by the State or States involved, and that those units, as well as local governments, were also prepared to support the railroad's essential services. Under the formula, Federal aid could not exceed whatever financial assistance is available from the States, including tax forgiveness.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of the New Haven are clear and immediate. The shortage of cash to meet operating expenses, continued pressure by creditors, and the uncertain status of the Penn-Central merger that would include the New Haven, point unmistakably to the need for prompt Federal action to assist the States of New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts in continuing the passenger service of the New Haven.

Following his meeting with the New England Governors last May, President Johnson asked Secretary of Transportation Alan Boyd to coordinate Federal efforts that might be of help to the New Haven. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], the principal sponsor of these measures in the other body, said:

That coordinating effort has now been underway for almost 3 months. It has produced a number of meetings, several ideas, many papers—and no action.

Prompt consideration of these bills would be one constructive way to demonstrate the administration's interest in the survival of the New Haven and the welfare of its passengers.

However, these bills would not meet the New Haven's immediate need for cash resources. Senator JAVITS and I met recently with representatives of several executive departments in an effort to establish a coordinated Federal program of emergency financing—on the order of \$5 to \$10 million—to carry the New Haven through until final court approval of the Penn-Central merger.

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. Gross) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. CLEVELAND'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. CLEVELAND (at the request of Mr. Gross) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)